

FOIAb3b

February 23, 1967

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A 853

**Vietnam Era Veterans**—For those veterans who have served on or after August 5, 1964, the President recommended:

Disability compensation at full wartime rates for all veterans.

Disability pensions for veterans and death pensions for widows and children.

Special medical care benefits, including medicines and drugs for severely disabled veterans on the pension rolls.

\$1600 toward the purchase of an automobile by veterans with special disabilities.

**Education**—The President proposed improvements in the educational benefits under the new G.I. Bill (P.L. 89-358) as follows:

An increase in the educational assistance allowance from \$100 monthly to \$130 for a single veteran. For married veterans with children the present \$150 monthly educational assistance allowance would be increased by \$10 a month for the second child and \$10 a month for each additional child. The President also recommended legislation to provide full G.I. Bill payments to educationally disadvantaged veterans so that they can complete high school without losing their eligibility \* \* \*.

**Insurance**—The President recommended an increase in servicemen's group life insurance, from a maximum of \$10,000 to a minimum of \$12,000—with higher amounts scaled to the pay of the serviceman—up to a maximum of \$30,000.

**Veterans of Prior Wars**—The President proposed a 5.4 percent increase in pensions for 1.4 million veterans, widows, and dependents. The increase would be effective July 1, 1967. The President also proposed that necessary safeguards be enacted to assure that no veteran will have his pension reduced as a result of increases in social security or other Federal retirement benefits.

The proposals outlined by the President in his message are estimated to have a first year cost of \$175 million. He said that to "assure the continuing soundness of these programs" he is directing the Administrator of Veterans Affairs, in consultation with leading veterans groups, to conduct a comprehensive study of the pension, compensation and benefits system for veterans, their families and their survivors, and to recommend to him by January 1968 "proposals to assure that our tax dollars are being utilized most wisely and that our Government is meeting fully its responsibilities to all those to whom we owe so much."

The President also included in his message a recommendation that Congress enact legislation to provide certain benefits to civilian employees of the Government on duty in hazardous areas.

The President indicated that he wanted prompt consideration by the Congress of the measures he proposed and said they "serve notice to these Americans—in and out of uniform—that we will never let them down. The Congress, the Executive Branch and the American people have accepted that obligation of honor to those who have fought and continue to fight in the defense of freedom."

The National Legislative Commission commends the President for his message and for the proposals he has recommended, many of which would substantially satisfy our Convention mandates. It would be premature to speculate on what will happen next and we await the introduction of legislation that will spell out the details. In remarks on the floor of the House yesterday Congressman Olin E. Teague (Tex.), Chairman of the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs, commended the President and said he was in full agreement with the proposals. He said he had scheduled immediate hearings on this legislation and predicted that the President's recommendations will be approved by his Committee and passed by the Congress. A number of other members of Congress commented favorably on the message including Congressman Carl Albert (Okla.), the Majority Leader of the House.

Senator Jennings Randolph (W. Va.), Chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on Veterans' Affairs, also expressed gratification at the President's recommendations. He said he is confident that significant advances in benefits can be achieved. Congressman E. Ross Adair (Ind.), ranking minority member of the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs, agreed that the message contained a great number of worthwhile proposals. He said the recommendations represent a change in attitude on the part of the White House and that most of the proposals have been sought in past years.

We are also pleased with the President's recommendations and are encouraged with that portion of the message in which he gives recognition to the fact that war veterans still retain their identity and have a special place in the Great Society.

Today, National Commander John E. Davis sent a telegram to the President commending him for his landmark message and expressing appreciation for the program he has recommended to the Congress.

As the President's message reached the Congress the Senate Committee on Finance reported S. 16, a bill to provide additional readjustment assistance to the veterans of service on or after August 5, 1964. This bill introduced by Senator Joseph M. Montoya (N.M.), with 67 co-sponsors is similar to S. 3680 of the 89th Congress. It would provide disability compensation at wartime rates under all circumstances; pension for nonservice-connected disability and death; burial allowance; certain medical care benefits such as drugs and therapeutic devices and automobile allowance of \$1600 for certain seriously disabled veterans.

The American Legion and its Auxiliary are quick to protest when the rights of war veterans and their dependents are jeopardized. We should be equally as prompt to express appreciation when our Government acts to accomplish our legislative objectives. While the proposals contained in the President's message do not fully satisfy our Convention mandates we believe they are a long step in the right direction.

It would not be inappropriate for our readers to express their appreciation of the recent action by the President and the Senate Committee on Finance. We will continue to keep you advised of developments on these important matters as they occur.

Norman Thomas, CIA Agent

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WATKINS M. ABBITT

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 23, 1967

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Speaker, last week, I took note of the revelation in the press that the Central Intelligence Agency was subsidizing the National Student Association. I did this by questioning the policy of feeding so much taxpayers' money into an organization so often identified with radical left-wing positions. This week, there is more of the same. The current revelation is how CIA through the tax-exempt J. M. Kaplan Fund, delivered more than \$1 million to a Socialist labor research organization headed by Mr. Socialist himself, Norman Thomas. Sacha Volman, another Socialist, reportedly convinced Thomas to set up the research organization and helped

February of 1967 in the light of an editorial appearing in the Richmond News-Leader on October 27, 1965. The astuteness of the editorial staff of the News-Leader speaks so eloquently for itself that I need add nothing here, except that the conclusions of the editorial—which I offer for inclusion in the RECORD—were strongly denied at the time by Mr. Thomas. Mr. Thomas still denies knowing of the CIA source of his support, but adds that it was his duty to know. "I acknowledge my own stupidity," he is quoted as saying. I can only suggest to Mr. Thomas that he could relieve that "stupidity" by paying more attention to non-Socialist writing such as is found in the News-Leader. I can also suggest to the CIA, as I have before, that they stop subsidizing left-wing causes. It is inconceivable that the information which that organization was created to gather cannot be obtained by a better method than by such heavy financing of organizations like Mr. Thomas' Institute for International Labor Research.

The News-Leader editorial follows:

NORMAN THOMAS, CIA AGENT

Mr. Norman Thomas courteously disagrees with our columnist, William F. Buckley, Jr., on the issues paramount in Santo Domingo. In our Forum today, he takes Mr. Buckley to task. The pamphlet he has sent is an orthodox performance of the school of thought that asks, why let cynical and corrupt generals rule, when cynical and corrupt socialists are willing and able? In short, it is a defense of the anti-Communist purity of former Dominican President, Juan Bosch—who no doubt was the kind of President Mr. Thomas six times aspired to be in the United States.

No notice need be taken here of these sentiments. However, it is certainly curious Mr. Thomas is so vehemently opposed to U.S. intervention in the affairs of the Dominican Republic. The pamphlet which he sends with his introduction is published in New York by the Institute for International Labor Research, an organization of which he happens to be chairman. The secretary-treasurer is one Sacha Volman, a Romanian refugee now a citizen of this country. The Institute is a tax-exempt "educational" organization.

Slightly more than one year ago, this socialist outfit came under fire in tax hearings before a committee of the House of Representatives. Together with unspecified grants from Harvard and Brandeis Universities, the Institute received in 1963 \$395,000 from the J. M. Kaplan Fund of New York, also a tax-exempt fund.

A story in *The New York Times* on September 3, 1964, revealed that the \$395,000 was by far the largest grant that the Kaplan Fund had made that year, according to its tax report. At the same time, the Fund reported that it received a mysterious sum of \$395,750, identified only as "Receipts Not Reported Elsewhere." Was this evidence of an in-and-out transaction?

At a stormy House hearing chaired by Representative Wright Patman, representatives of the IRS testified that Kaplan Fund had not had its tax-exemption revoked because the foundation was being used as a "conduit" for CIA funds. The inescapable conclusion is that the CIA funneled \$395,000 into Norman Thomas' socialist Institute for International Labor Research. Moreover, indications were that similar financial arrangements had been in effect for a number of years. The question is: What for?

Well, the Institute for International Labor Research has been interested in the Caribbean revolution for quite a while. J. M. Kaplan, a financier, former president of the Welch

A 854

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

February 23, 1967

Grape Juice Company, who spent a decade in Latin American sugar-producing countries. In the late Fifties, Kaplan, through his tax-exempt foundation, organized an ambitious propaganda organization in Costa Rica: The Institute of Political Research. Principals in this operation were the Romulo Betancourt gang—Jose Figueres, Haya de la Torre, Juan Bosch, and Sacha Volman. When Trujillo was assassinated, the shop moved to Santo Domingo.

Rumors abound that when Juan Bosch returned to the Dominican Republic, his election was bought and paid for by the CIA, using well-established techniques of buying and intimidating an ignorant and illiterate populace. At any rate, the first thing that Juan Bosch did was to turn the direction of state-planning activities over to the American, Sacha Volman. To do the job, Volman set up a private organization, Inter-American Center for Social Studies. Like magic, funds materialized from the Ford Foundation and the Parvin Foundation of California. According to *The New York Times*, funds also came from the Agency for International Development—the foreign aid branch of the U.S. State Department. Although the story had been given out by the Bosch government that the socialization of the Dominican Republic had been entrusted to Sacha Volman because he was an “anti-Communist,” the same Sacha Volman was the first person kicked out of Santo Domingo after the coup of September, 1963, because of his Marxist ideas.

So on the one hand Sacha Volman is secretary-treasurer of the Norman Thomas group, which received \$395,000 from the CIA, and on the other he is director of the Bosch regime outfit, which was supported in part by U.S. foreign aid. In both cases, the intention was the same: to impose an anti-capitalist ideology on a defenseless nation by U.S. government intervention. The explanation, of course, is that the halls of U.S. policy are filled with contending factions, interventionists all. Mr. Thomas would prefer to have all the intervention on his side.

## “Where Do Grandpas Come From?”

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH L. CAREY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 23, 1967

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, I want to share with my colleagues a very fine article on the antipoverty foster grandparents program. The article, entitled “Where Do Grandpas Come From?” is by Dorothy Brant Warnick, and appears in the January issue of the *St. Anthony Messenger*, a nationally circulated Catholic family magazine. Miss Warnick describes the foster grandparents program in considerable detail, and her assessment of its worth is emphatically affirmative. She quotes a local project director as saying that the entire program “is an excellent combination of a group of children with a tremendous need of someone to help them, and a group of old people with an equally great need to help someone.”

Mr. Speaker, the foster grandparents program has so far only been operated on a pilot basis, but it is already helping to win the war on poverty in 35 communities. This is a very surprising benefit to tens of thousands of disad-

vantaged little children and senior citizens, and I hope that it can be extended to meet more of this need.

Mr. Speaker, I include Miss Warnick's article from the *St. Anthony Messenger* at this point in the Record.

## WHERE DO GRANDPAS COME FROM

RECIPE: a) Take one child, mix him up a bit, separate him from home and parents, toss him with strangers. b) Take one elderly person, slice his income, let him stew in idleness. c) Fold in a new plan and stir well.

This rather remarkable combination of ingredients is being tested in the Foster Grandparents Plan, sponsored by the Federal Office of Economic Opportunity (OEO).

The new program is designed to benefit two classes of persons. First, infants and young children classified as unfortunate, abandoned, dependent, neglected, abused, helpless or otherwise needy, who are living in institutions.

Second, the plan gives extra income to elderly Americans, 60 or over, whose income leaves them in a poverty status. They are able to supplement their income with approximately \$25 a week in a job that comes naturally, and in which age is no deterrent. As one man put it, “You are never so old that you have forgotten how to hold a child.”

Funded as a one-year demonstration project, it was given its first grants, amounting to \$2,670,941, on August 29, 1965. The benefits reached 1,217 grandparents and 1,643 children. (The number of children may go as high as 2,500, because of the regular turnover in patient load.)

In these pilot programs the government is trying to reach all categories of children. The home in St. Cloud, Minnesota, is involved with retarded teenagers; Akron, Ohio, with children who have gone from foster home to foster home because they are unable to adjust to adults; Tampa, Florida, with chronically ill children in hospitals and sanitariums; and New York City with crippled children in an orthopedic hospital. Hopefully, foster homes will eventually be found for many of these children. Some will be returned to their own homes.

So successful has the program been in the initial 22 cities that it is already being expanded to include 38 new projects.

## SOLVING TWO PROBLEMS AT ONCE

Sargent Shriver, Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity, said, in announcing this expansion, “Thousands of men and women over 60 are unemployed, many because of their age. They are able and eager to work and urgently need additional income, yet doors of business and industry are shut to them. They have skills, wisdom and experience as well as generous supplies of love and understanding that can greatly benefit unwanted, neglected infants, as well as retarded and emotionally disturbed children.”

The entire program, as one of its directors describes it, “is an excellent combination of a group of children with a tremendous need of someone to help them, and a group of old people with an equally great need to help someone.”

There was never any doubt as to the children's needs. In many homes, the staff was simply too pressured to give more than custodial and physical care, feeding, bathing and changing the children. And in the minds of the children, who hadn't had a visitor for six months, there was no doubt about what was needed.

In the beginning, there was apprehension as to whether or not these elderly folks would want to work, would be able to work, and would be faithful if given the opportunity to work.

Not only was the apprehension unfounded, but the elderly folks were so eager to work that they were

to do, but they have proven themselves physically able to be so faithful that there has been little absenteeism. In fact, one of the biggest problems is that they arrive for work too early and want to work longer than they should.

W. E. Gursch, Director of the project at the Denton State School with 1,750 retardates in Texas, explained, “Our foster grandparents were scheduled to work four hours a day, five days a week. We soon found some of them so enthusiastic that they wanted to work seven days a week so that the child would not regress in their absence.”

## HEALING THE CHILD'S OUTLOOK

“The response of the children is even more heartwarming than the joy of the grandparents in this work,” added Gursch. “Soon after the appearance of the Foster Grandparents, many of the children began to change. They lost some of their apathetic look.”

In all the cities where the program is in effect, stories are told of the improvement in the children—simple tales of less crying, less spilling of food at mealtime, less whining. Children have begun using a spoon to feed themselves for the first time; some are beginning to talk; others are making the first steps in toilet training. There are tales of fewer temper tantrums, fewer behavior problems, less pouting and sulking.

In Honolulu, project director Kiyoshi Matsukuma told of one “non-verbal child who burst out the word ‘mama’ in a tearful situation to everyone's surprise, disbelief and joy.” Another boy, with suicidal tendencies, had a dangerous habit of running into moving cars. After two months with his grandfather, he stands on a street and has learned to walk within a marked crosswalk for pedestrians.

At the outset, there was some suspicion about this new plan. Senior citizens questioned whether or not there was some “gimmick.” Who would hire people who had been retired, people in the age group 60 and over?

However, announcement of the plan in the newspaper, over the radio and television brought such response that almost immediately, the program was oversubscribed. One area had over 600 applicants for only 39 positions!

## TRAINING FOR UNDERSTANDING

A training program was given in all the cities to help the older folks be more confident in an already familiar and loved role. No new skills were introduced in the training.

Instead, the “grandparents” were brought up to date on the newer techniques of child care, and shown films such as “The Trusting 2's and the Terrible 3's,” which they could relate to their own experience with children. There were story-telling sessions, instructions in crafts, and field trips to such places as day nurseries and treatment centers.

One thing was different about the training, however. Grandparents were led to understand the meaning and effect of institutional placement upon young children when they are deprived of maternal care.

In some special cases, extra training was necessary in the handling of retarded and emotionally ill children. Perhaps the most important task of all, though, was to prepare these elderly people for the rejection they might receive from the children.

In Cleveland, Ohio, Florence Hangach, project director of the program sponsored by the Catholic Charities bureau there, put it this way, “Children who have been hurt by adults, as many of these children have, are inclined to lash out at any adult figure, and the grandparents might come in for a share of this rejection. We realized this would be difficult for them, and felt it was necessary to prepare them to handle children who might be unwilling to cooperate with